

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11-17, 19, 20, 22-26, 28 and 30 remain pending in the application.

Claims 1-5, 11-15 and 22-24 over O'Neal in view of Gulick

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 11-15 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 6,411,685 to O'Neal ("O'Neal") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,483,577 to Gulick ("Gulick"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-5, 11-15 and 22-24 recite a voice message that is automatically **compressed**, moved and stored in a deleted voice message memory upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to **delete** the voice message from a user accessible voice message memory.

The Examiner acknowledges that "O'Neal fails to teach automatic compressing the voice message before storing in the trash Bin." (see Office Action, page 3) The Examiner relies on Gulick to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in O'Neal to arrive at the claimed features. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Gulick appears to disclose a single chip digital answering machine comprising a memory interface for controlling storage in and retrieval of data from memory (see Abstract). To reduce physical memory requirements, voice data is preferably compressed for storage and decompressed for playback (see Gulick, col. 2, lines 18-25).

Thus, Gulick at best teaches compression of voice data to reduce physical memory requirements for playback. Neither, Gulick, nor any of the other of the Examiner's cited prior art, disclose, teach or suggest tying **compression** of a voice message to the specific event claimed, i.e., upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to **delete** a voice message, much less a voice message that is automatically **compressed**, moved and stored in a deleted voice message memory upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to **delete** the voice message from a user accessible voice message memory, as recited by claims 1-5, 11-15 and 22-24.

Thus, O'Neal and Gulick, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest tying **compression** of a voice message to activation of a user selectable option to **delete** the voice message, much less a voice message that is automatically **compressed**, moved and stored in a deleted voice message memory upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to **delete** the voice message from a user accessible voice message memory, as recited by claims 1-5, 11-15 and 22-24.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-5, 11-15 and 22-24 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 16 and 17 over O'Neal, Gulick and Murray

Claims 6, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over O'Neal, Gulick, and further yet in view of U.S. Pat. No. U.S. Pat. No. 5,369,697 to Murray et al. ("Murray"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 6, 16 and 17 recite a voice message that is automatically **compressed**, moved and stored in a deleted voice message memory upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to **delete** the voice message from a user accessible voice message memory. As explained above, O'Neal in view of Gulick fails to teach this feature.

The Examiner agrees that O'Neal in view of Gulick fails to disclose, teach or suggest automatically deleting old voice messages after a time period (Office Action, page 7). However, the Examiner cites Murray to allegedly make up for the void in the prior art.

Murray's invention is directed toward a system and method for automatic switching between pulse code and DTMF signals generated by a telephone (Abstract). Murray appears to describe conventional voice mail that deletes old messages after a period of time (col. 4, lines 25-30). Murray fails to disclose, teach or suggest use of compression in any way, much less disclose, teach or suggest a voice message that is automatically **compressed**, moved and

stored in a deleted voice message memory upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to **delete** the voice message from a user accessible voice message memory, as recited by claims 1-5, 11-15 and 22-24.

Thus, O'Neal, Gulick and Murray, either alone or in combination, fails to disclose, teach or suggest automatic compression of a voice message upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to **delete**, much less a voice message that is automatically **compressed**, moved and stored in a deleted voice message memory upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to **delete** the voice message from a user accessible voice message memory, as recited by claims 6, 16 and 17.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 6, 16 and 17 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 7, 8, 19 and 25 over O'Neal in view of Gulick and Garson

In the Office Action, claims 7, 8, 19 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over O'Neal, Gulick, and further still in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,689,550 to Garson et al. ("Garson"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 7, 8, 19 and 25 recite a voice message that is automatically **compressed**, moved and stored in a deleted voice message memory upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to **delete** the voice message from a user accessible voice message memory.

As discussed above, O'Neal in view of Gulick fails to disclose, teach or suggest automatic compression of a voice message upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to **delete**, much less a voice message that is automatically **compressed**, moved and stored in a deleted voice message memory upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to **delete** the voice message from a user accessible voice message memory, as recited by claims 7, 8, 19 and 25.

The Examiner relied on Garson to allegedly disclose deletion of

oldest voice messages from a memory queue when the memory queue reaches its limit by percentage of memory area or by the number of messages (Office Action, page 8). However, a thorough reading of Garson reveals that Garson lacks any teachings tying **compression** of a voice message to a upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to delete, much less disclose, teach or suggest a voice message that is automatically **compressed**, moved and stored in a deleted voice message memory upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to delete the voice message from a user accessible voice message memory, as recited by claims 7, 8, 19 and 25.

Thus, O'Neal, Gulick, and Garson, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest **compression** of a voice message upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to delete, much less a voice message that is automatically **compressed**, moved and stored in a deleted voice message memory upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to delete the voice message from a user accessible voice message memory, as recited by claims 7, 8, 19 and 25.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 7, 8, 19 and 25 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9, 20 and 26 over O'Neal in view of Gulick and Sweet

Claims 9, 20 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over O'Neal, Gulick, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,163,085 to Sweet et al. ("Sweet"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 9, 20 and 26 recite a voice message that is automatically **compressed**, moved and stored in a deleted voice message memory upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to delete the voice message from a user accessible voice message memory.

The Examiner alleged that Sweet discloses "that when voice messages in a voice file (memory) reach a predetermined percentage level, the

oldest voice messages in the voice file will be deleted (column 12, lines 53-60).” (see Office Action, page 9) However, a thorough reading of Sweet reveals that he fails to disclose, teach or suggest tying **compression** of a voice message to a upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to **delete**, much less a voice message that is automatically **compressed**, moved and stored in a deleted voice message memory upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to **delete** the voice message from a user accessible voice message memory, as recited by claims 9, 20 and 26.

Thus, O’Neal, Gulick and Sweet, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest a voice message that is automatically **compressed**, moved and stored in a deleted voice message memory upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to **delete** the voice message from a user accessible voice message memory, as recited by claims 9, 20 and 26.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 9, 20 and 26 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 28 and 30 over O’Neal, Gulick and Tow

Claims 28 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over O’Neal and Gulick, and further in view of EP 820182 to Tow (“Tow”). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 28 and 30 recite a voice message that is automatically **compressed**, moved and stored in a deleted voice message memory upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to **delete** the voice message from a user accessible voice message memory.

Tow was relied on by the Examiner to disclose dynamically modifying disk space for mailboxes (Office Action, page 12). However, a reading of Tow reveals that his disclosure lacks any relevance to **compression** of **deleted** voice messages, as recited by claims 28 and 30.

Thus, O’Neal, Gulick and Tow, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest a voice message that is automatically **compressed**,

moved and stored in a **deleted** voice message memory upon activation of a user selectable keypad option to **delete** the voice message from a user accessible voice message memory, as respectively recited by claims 28 and 30.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 28 and 30 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor
Washington D.C. 20036-3307
WHB/df